

## Decision for DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2012-47-DNA

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Roswell Resource Management Plan, as amended, and was analyzed in **EA# NM-060-2001-028**. The Proposed Action will authorize 3 cattle yearlong at 100 % Public Land for 38 Animal Unit Months (AUMs) on allotment 62006.

If you wish to protest this proposed decision in accordance with 43 CFR 4160.2, you are allowed 15 days to do so in person or in writing to the authorized officer, after the receipt of this decision. Please be specific in your points of protest.


The protest shall be filed with the Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management, 2909 West 2<sup>nd</sup>, Roswell, NM 88201. This protest should specify, clearly and concisely, why you think the proposed action is in error. In the absence of a protest within the time allowed, the above decision shall constitute my final decision. Should this notice become the final decision, you are allowed an additional 30 days within which to file an appeal for the purpose of a hearing before the Interior Board of Land Appeals, and to petition for stay of the decision pending final determination on the appeal (43 CFR 4.21 and 4.410). If a petition for stay is not requested and granted, the decision will be put into effect following the 30-day appeal period. The appeal and petition for stay should be filed with the Field Manager at the above address. The appeal should specify, clearly and concisely, why you think the decision is in error. The petition for stay should specify how you will be harmed if the stay is not granted.

/s/ Jerry Dutchover  
Jerry Dutchover  
Assistant Field Manager, Resources

06/05/2012  
Date



# Guadalupe Draw -62006-



**U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management**  
**Pecos District, Roswell Field Office**  
**Documentation of Land Use Plan Compliance**  
**and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

## DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2012-47-DNA

A. Roswell Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.:

Proposed Action Title/Type: Term grazing lease  
Location of Proposed Action: Allotment #62006

Description of Proposed Action: Renew the term grazing permit for Allotment #62006

Applicant (if any): Permittee

### B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: *Roswell Resource Management Plan*, Date Approved: October 1997

LUP Name: *New Mexico Standards for Rangeland Health & Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management*, Date Approved: January 2001

Other document: *EA# NM-060-2001-028*, Date Approved: November 2001

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

*Roswell Resource Management Plan*, Date Approved: October 1997

*New Mexico Standards for Rangeland Health & Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management*  
Date Approved: January 2001

### C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

*EA# NM-060-2001-028*, Date Approved: November 2001

### D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

2.

Yes. The current Proposed Action was analyzed in the above mentioned Environmental Assessment (EA). The proposed action is the same action analyzed in the existing NEPA document.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes. The existing NEPA documents analyzed the proposed action as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The EA was reviewed by identified public interests and no conflicts or concerns were identified. The same applies to the current proposed action given current concerns, interests, and resource values.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes. The proposed action is the same as the proposed action as analyzed in the EA. The EA was recently completed and there is no new information or circumstances in regard to this allotment which would warrant further analysis.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document? [Document and explain]

Yes, the direct, indirect and cumulative effects would be the same as stated in the existing NEPA document. The effects would not be changed considering the proposed action is the same as the proposed action as analyzed in the EA, along with no change in management.

E. Concerning cultural resources, grazing has the potential to impact. The Roswell Field Office reviews the local office and NMCRIS databases for every grazing permit or leasing action at both the Environmental Assessment level and this Documentation of NEPA Adequacy level. In situations where sensitive sites lie within an allotment, site specific visits may be conducted to assess the presence of effects. One survey and no sites have been reported in this allotment. Currently, there is no evidence that grazing activities at this intensity have adversely impacted any cultural resources; however, unforeseen impacts may occur. Any future range improvement involving earth disturbing activities will require a cultural inventory prior to approval.

#### Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Kyle Arnold	Rangeland Management Specialist-BLM-RFO
Jeremy Iliff	Archeologist-BLM-RFO

Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

#### Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s/ KyleArnold  
Project Lead

02/29/2012  
Date

/s/ Jerry Dutchover  
Jerry Dutchover  
Assistant Field Manager, Resources

06/05/2012  
Date

**Bureau of Land Management, Roswell Field Office**  
**Environmental Assessment Checklist, DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2012-47-DNA**

Resources	Not Present on Site	No Impacts	May Be Impacts	Mitigation Included	BLM Reviewer	Date
Air Quality			X	X	/s/ Michael McGee Hydrologist	2/21/12
Soil			X	X		
Watershed Hydrology			X	X		
Floodplains	X					
Water Quality - Surface			X	X		
Water Quality - Ground			X	X	/s/ Michael McGee Hydrologist	2/21/12
Cultural Resources			X	X	/s/ Jeremy Iliff Archeologist	2/15/2012
Native American Religious Concerns	X					
Paleontology		X				
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	X				/s/ Glen Garnand Environ & Planning	2/21/2012
Farmlands, Prime or Unique	X				/s/ Vanessa G. Bussell Realty Specialist	1/30/2012
Rights-of-Way	X					
Invasive, Non-native Species	X				/s/ Adam Ortega Range Management Specialist	1/30/12
Vegetation			X	X		
Livestock Grazing			X	X		
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid	X				/s/ Jared Reese Nat. Resource Spec.	2/21/2012
Threatened or Endangered Species	X				/s/ D. Baggao Wildlife	2/8/2012
Special Status Species	X					
Wildlife			X	X		
Wetlands/Riparian Zones	X					
Wild and Scenic Rivers	X					
Wilderness	X				/s/ Michael J. Bilbo Cave Specialist/ Interim Outdoor Recreation Planner	1/26/12
Recreation		X				
Visual Resources		X				
Cave/Karst	X					
Environmental Justice		X			/s/ Jared Reese Nat. Resource Spec.	2/21/2012
Public Health and Safety		X				
Solid Mineral Resources		X			/s/ Al Collar Geologist	2/29/2012
Fluid Mineral Resources		X			/s/ John S. Simitz Geologist	2/15/2012